

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-17 are pending in the present application, claim 8 having been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Claims Objections**

Claim 16 stands objected to because of a number of listed informalities. Applicants note these objections and have amended claim in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of this objection.

### **Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Office Action asserts that it is not clear whether the limitation "check-in ID" refers to "user ID", "IP address," "PrivID" or "MSISDN". This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 broadly claims a "check-in ID" which is received from the subscriber. There is nothing vague or indefinite about the claim limitation in which the relationship is stated – "receiving a check-in ID from the subscriber." Claim 16 further limits the check-in ID as being "one of an Mobile Station ISDN Number MSISDN and/or an International Mobile Subscriber Identity IMSI received from the subscriber." Claim 3 recites that the Radius server is used to receive the check-in ID. The specification states, on page 3, lines 12-14, "[w]ithin the context Radius server 2 receives the MSISDN and/or the IMSI of the subscriber." Applicant respectfully submits that reading the claims as a whole, and considering them in light of the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what Applicant is claiming by the limitation "check-in ID." Claim 1 is broadly recited, and as long as the specification enables

one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, nothing more is required.

That standard is met here. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,977,917 (“Skog”). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 8, as well as other limitations thus rendering this rejection moot. Applicant will therefore discuss the merits of the rejection of previous claim 8. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,155,526 (“Chaudhary”). Claims 6, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0154400 (“Pirttimaa”). Claims 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,517 (“Naim”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 8. The Office admits that Skog does not disclose a routing module provided as a standard entry point of all messages, wherein the routing module decides by evaluation of the PrivID which network node will handle the message. The Office cites Naim as allegedly teaching this feature. Claim 1 also has been amended to recite “wherein when a protocol other than SIP is found, the message is routed to a proxy server”. Support for this amendment is found in the specification, page 6, lines 1-10, and page 6, line 29-page 7, line 6. These features are not taught by Naim.

In particular, Naim does disclose a wireless soft switch (WSS) which can handle the SIP protocol. But Naim does not disclose either that the WSS routes the message based on the PrivID, or what happens with the protocol in the message is not SIP. Thus, Naim does not disclose, *inter alia*, “providing a routing module (7) as a standard entry point for all messages and deciding, in the routing module (7), by evaluation of the PrivID, which network node will handle the message, wherein when a protocol other than SIP is found, the message is routed to a proxy server”. Thus, even assuming for the sake of argument only, that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Skog and Naim, the result would not have been Applicant’s claimed invention.

Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action. Claims 2, 6-7, 13, and 15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and features recited therein. Therefore, withdrawn of the rejection of claims 2, 6-8, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully request.

### **Conclusion**

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-17 are patentable over the prior art of record whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that

Appln. No. 10/566,584  
Amdt. dated July 14, 2009  
Reply to Office action of April 14, 2009

the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/  
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\R\rieb\blicker1\пто\2009-07-14Amendment.doc